



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of Mercury and Apollo in the Gallic and Germanic lands, of Mars in southern Gaul, of Silvanus in Dalmatia, Pannonia, Dacia, and Upper Moesia, of Hercules in southern Spain and Africa, all prove no less the assimilation of the devotees into the Roman imperial system than the absorption of the local gods into the Roman pantheon. The inscriptions found in the southern part of Aquitania seem to indicate the existence there in the second and third centuries of large bodies of slaves and freedmen established on estates; and on the frontiers the armies clearly marked their presence by dedications to their favorite gods.

This variety in religious expression, which Toutain shows was found everywhere in the western provinces, attests as nothing else could do the spontaneous character of the provincials' devotion. Rome did not impose a fixed form of official worship on her subjects, but allowed them entire freedom. There is no proof, for instance, that the imperial power ever tried to compel the worship of the living emperor or of the *divi*—save in the requirement of oaths—, although it well knew the worth of such devotion in stimulating the loyalty of its subjects and valued it as a means by which the provincials might be absorbed and Romanised. To-day the stronger European nations, as well as the United States, are engaged in colonial experiments which thus far have not been successful. As has been more than once pointed out, the Romans understood how to assimilate their subject peoples, modern nations know only how to dominate and overawe them. Toutain very aptly suggests that we may find a valuable lesson for ourselves in the tact and toleration of the Romans, in their unwillingness to impose their own gods on their subjects or to interfere with the native religions; they left to time and association their sure work.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

T. S. DENISON, *Nauatl or Mexican in Aryan Phonology*.
Chicago, T. S. Denison, Publisher.

With the best will in the world it is hard for the professional scholar, overlooking shortcomings of technique, to give a fair reading to the work of an amateur. It is hard not to approach it as a Pharisee—or a Brahmin. At the startling assertion of cognation between Mexican and primitive Aryan, and more particularly the Indo-Iranian group—and this is the thesis of Mr. Denison's book—it is hard not to feel the hostility of surprise. But the author has made a conscientious study of his problem and, barring details of technique, his method is fundamentally sound, as far as it goes. If his classifications are not quite as rigid as such classifications can now be made in Indo-European

Comparative Philology, they are not less rigid than such classifications were a few decades ago.

Granted the Aryan origin of Mexican, who could, *a priori*, refuse his assent to comparisons like the following?—Mex. *pacha* 'woolly': Lat. *pecus*, Mex. *patli* 'potion': Lat. *potat* (better *poculum*), Mex. *patlauac* 'broad': Lat. *patulus*; Mex. *cantli* 'cheek': Lat. *gena*, Mex. *conetl* 'child': Lat. *genus*. These are average samples taken from a comparison of some eight score Mexican 'roots' with Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Germanic words. Nor are the comparisons limited to the obvious. With much patience the author had elaborated the phonetic law, *r* > *u/i*: one realizes how, when he subsequently found this phonetic change in the Iranian group, his theory seemed to him a demonstration.

But it is no proof of cognation for languages to exhibit a pretty wide correspondence in root material. The number of conveniently utterable vocables is not great, and the store of fundamentally distinct notions to which our stock may be reduced is small—or, to put it in another way, the reach of semantic change is immense. The Aryan and Semitic groups exhibit no insignificant correspondence in root material, without our being convinced that the correspondence means cognation (see, e. g., M. A. Cuny's review of Möller's *Semitisch und Indo-Germanisch* in the *Bulletin d. l. Société de Linguistique*, 14, ccxlv; [but now see Pedersen, *l.f.* 22, 341 sq., for a quite favourable counterview]). A correspondence of groups of words, as of the numerals and names of relationship in the Aryan languages, might start conviction of cognation, and a correspondence in flexions or word-formation would clinch it. Should Mr. Denison enlarge his present brochure, as his preface hints, it would be well to search for such correspondences. As a starting point he might institute a comparison of the person signs prefixed to the Mexican and affixed to the Sanskrit verb, to wit: 1st sg. Mex. *ni*-: Skr. *-mi* (impv. *-ni*), 2d sg. Mex. *ti*- (impv. *ši*-): Skr. *-si*, 3d sg. Mex. —: Skr. *-ti*, 1st plur. Mex. *ti*-: Skr. *-mas*, 2d plur. Mex. *an*-: Skr. *-thas* (*-tam*), 3d plur. Mex. —: Skr. *-an(ti)*. The different allocation of *ti* in the two languages for person might be explained on the theory that 2d and 3d person are merely a nearer and a remoter non-ego; and one might compare the person allocation of Lat. *iste* in contrast with *ille*, or the repetition of *hi* to mean first 'this (the near) group' and second 'that (the far) group'. Similarly note Mex. *an*- 'you': Skr. *-an(ti)* 'they'. Not without interest is the Mexican use of *ti*- 'thou'—in combination with a change of accent in the verb stem—for 'we', as if 'we' were 'I + thou' with a (polite) suppression of the 'I.' It would seem also a patent suggestion to identify the Mexican general noun-formative *tl/tli* with the IE. instrumental suffix *tlo-*, as e. g. in the already cited Mex. *patli*: Lat. *poculum* (from **potlom*).

In a revision of the essay a sharp eye should be kept on inconsistencies, whether of explanation or of statement: thus in the equation of Mex. *cui* with Skr. *grabh-* 'to take', once the *r* is said to be dropped (p. 23); once (p. 12) it is said to be represented by *ui* (? or *i*); and again (p. 9) the *u* is derived from *bh*. There must be confusion here, either in the author's conception or in his statements. It were well also to note that Mex. *pal*: Skr. *bhar-* 'to bear', based on the laws $p < bh$, and $l < r$ might, on the same principles, be compared with Lat. *por-tat*. This emphasizes again the uncertainty attendant on comparisons of root material only. As for the author's derivation of *naua-laua* 'to ridicule', the probability of onomatopoeia here puts any other explanation at a disadvantage.

EDWIN W. FAY.